REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Examiner's Office Action dated 10/4/2004. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the remarks that follow.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-31 are pending.

Claims 1-15 and 19-31 are rejected based on informalities which we will address in our response.

Claims 16, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Clancey et al. (USP 6,216,098).

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Combs et al. (USP 5,909,211) in view of Clancey et al.

Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Combs et al. in view of Clancey et al. and further in view of Capps et al. (USP 6,512,525).

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Combs et al. in view of Clancey et al. and further in view of Slotznick (USP 6,108,640).

Claims 5-7 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Combs et al. in view of Clancey et al. and further in view of Schuster (USP 6,446,127).

Claims 8-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Combs et al. in view of Clancey et al. and further in view of Kadaba et al. (USP 6,285,916).

Claims 12-14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Combs et al. in view of Clancey et al. and further in view of Carman, II (USP 5,454,046).

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Combs et al. in view of Clancey et al. and further in view of Schneider et al. (USP 6,427,079).

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clancey et al. in view of Hurt et al. (USP 5,546,337).

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clancey et al. in view of Slotznick.

Claims 21-23 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clancey et al. in view of Narayanaswami (USP 6,504,571).

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clancey et al. in view of Narayanaswami and further in view of Slotznick.

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clancey et al. in view of Kadaba et al. and further in view of Narayanaswami.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clancey et al. in view of Kadaba et al. and further in view of Narayanaswami and Slotznick.

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clancey et al. in view of Narayanaswami and further in view of Slotznick and Capps et al.

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clancey et al. in view of Kadaba et al. and further in view of Narayanaswami.

Claims 29-30 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clancey et al. in view of Eldridge et al. (USP 6,515,988) and further in view of Ausems et al. (USP 6,434,403).

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clancey et al. in view of Eldridge et al. and further in view of Ausems et al. and Slotznick.

Claims 1-28 have been amended to clarify and correct minor inconsistencies without adding new matter.

OVERVIEW OF CLAIMED INVENTION

The presently claimed invention relates to the manipulation of electronic media by the manipulation of a probe over off-line media, such as a book or a magazine. Based on the position of the probe over the off-line media, corresponding electronic media is retrieved from storage and presented to the user (i.e., the electronic media presented to the user is synchronized to the position information of the probe). This synchronization takes place such that the data presented to the user corresponds to an output a real tool would produce. In one embodiment of the invention, the off-line media is not modified in any special way to enable synchronization with electronic media. In another embodiment, the off-line media is modified to include a plurality of icons that are printed thereon, each indicating a different real tool and the user selects the real tool he/she wants to simulate.

Real tool in this invention refers a tool that allows individuals to explore the world though manipulation and observation. Examples of a real tool include, but are not limited to: a telescope, spectrum analyzer, radio telescope, magnetometer, scale, seismometer, ground penetrating radar, x-ray, pH device, thermometer, stethoscope, electrophoretic device, Geiger counter, chemical assay device, book reader, word pronouncer, book translator and dictionary. Thus, the synchronization of the probe position with electronic media and presentation of the output takes place such that any of the above mentioned tools are simulated to provide the user with a visceral experience.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 112

The examiner had rejected claims 1-15 and 19-31 under 35 USC §112 as "containing subject matter which was not described in the specification". Applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's assertion. "Real tool" in the invention refers to a tool that allows individuals to explore the world though manipulation and observation so as to provide the individuals with a visceral experience. Specifically, with respect to the disclosure of a "real tool", the examiner is directed to the summary of the application-as-filed where applicant states that the multimedia data represents an output generated "when the real tool is used to inspect the items in the off-line media". In the same section of the application-as-filed, applicant also states that the output provides a "visceral experience normally experienced by a user of a real tool". Furthermore, the examiner is directed to page 25, line 4 – page 26, line 8, where applicant has provided various non-limiting examples of real tools. Such examples include, but are not limited to a telescope, spectrum analyzer, radio telescope, scale, seismometer, ground penetrating radar, X-Ray device, pH meter, thermometer, stethoscope, electrophoretic tools, chemical assay devices, art instructor and language teacher. The examiner is also directed to claims (as-filed) 4, 20, 24, 27 and 31, which provide examples of real tools.

On pages 3-4 of the office action, under subheadings 8-10, the examiner asserts that in claims 1-31 the word "system" (specifically claims 1-31), the word "utilize", (specifically claim 10) and the phrase "real tool" (specifically claims 1-15 and 19-31) render the respective claims "vague and indefinite" as "it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention". For specific support, the examiner cites MPEP §2173.05(d). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's assertion. MPEP §2173.05(d) deals with Exemplary Claim Language ("for example", "such as"). Applicant notes that the rejected claims do not

contain the phrase "for example", the phrase "such as", or equivalents thereof. Therefore, applicant contends that claims 1-31 were improperly rejected under 35 USC §112, and hereby request the examiner to withdraw the rejections.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 102

The examiner has rejected claims 16, 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,216,098 (Clancey et al.), hereafter Clancy. To be properly rejected under 102(e), each and every element of the claims must be disclosed in a single cited reference. The applicant, however, contends that the presently claimed invention cannot be anticipated in view of the Clancy reference.

The examiner asserts that Clancey provides for a method and apparatus to model behavior. With respect to independent claim 16, the examiner, on page 5 of the office action, equates the limitation of claim 16's "hand held imager" with that of the description of column 1, lines 35-50 of the Clancey reference. A closer read of the citations, and the Clancey reference in its entirety, teaches otherwise. Specifically, column 1, lines 35-50 of the Clancey reference, merely teaches a "simulation tool" for "creating, manipulating, running and presenting models". Furthermore, the citations suggest the use of a "Brahms simulation engine". Conspicuously absent in the citations and the Clancey reference in its entirety is a "hand held imager" that is able to detect a region of off-line media (such as a book or a magazine) and transmit an electronic representation of the region to a computer. Hence, applicant contends that independent claim 16 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Clancey reference.

With respect to independent claim 16, the examiner, on page 5 of the office action, further equates the limitation of claim 16's presentation device that presents electronic media "synchronized to said region of off-line media" with that of the description of column 45, lines 31-53 of the Clancey reference. A closer read of the citations, and the Clancey reference in its entirety, teaches otherwise. Specifically, applicant contends that column 45, lines 31-53 of the Clancey reference merely teaches the synchronization of timing between clients in the simulation by an event manager. However, it does not discuss the synchronization of a region of off-line media detected by the imager to the electronic media and also does not discuss a presentation method that presents electronic media based on this synchronization. Hence, applicant once again contends that independent claim 16 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Clancey reference.

Applicant wishes to state that the arguments presented above with respect to independent claim 16 substantially apply to dependent claims 17 and 19 as they inherit the limitations of the claim from which they depend.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable by U.S. patent 5,909,211 (Combs et. al), hereafter Combs in view of Clancey. To be properly rejected under U.S.C. §103(a), each and every element of the claims must be addressed through known prior art or be recognized as an obvious variation thereof. Applicant contends that the combination of the Combs and Clancey references fail to provide many of the limitations of applicant's pending claims.

The examiner asserts that Clancey provides for a method and apparatus to model behavior. With respect to independent claim 1, the examiner, on page 7 of the office action, equates the limitation of claim 1's real tool that is "simulated", with that of the description of column 1, lines 35-50 of the Clancey reference. A closer read of the citations, and the Clancey reference in its entirety, teaches otherwise. Specifically, column 1, lines 35-50 of the Clancey reference teaches a "simulation tool" for "creating, manipulating, running and presenting models". Furthermore, the citations suggest the use of a "Brahms simulation engine". However, it does not discuss the simulation of a real tool (such as a telescope or X-Ray device).

With respect to independent claim 1, the examiner, on page 7 of the office action, equates the limitation of claim 1's probe device that comprises a hand-held probe section, with that of the description of column 5, lines 56-61 of the Clancey reference. A closer read of the citations, and the Clancey reference in its entirety, teaches otherwise. Specifically, column 5, line 56-61 of the Clancey reference teaches a "personal digital assistant coupled to a comparator process for transferring information by a wireless link" between a user and an intelligent agent. Conspicuously absent in the citations and the Clancey reference in its entirety is a "probe device" that identifies and synchronizes an off-line medium (such as a book or a magazine) to multimedia data. Claim 1 of the invention, does not require the probe device to be wireless but requires the probe device to have a hand-held probe section.

With respect to independent claim 1, the examiner, on page 7 of the office action, equates the limitation of claim 1's transmitting of a selected portion of an image to a computer using a probe device, with that of the description of column 3, line 6 of the Combs reference. A closer read of the citations, and the Combs reference in its entirety, teaches otherwise. Specifically,

applicant contends that column 3, line 6 of the Combs reference merely teaches sensor, scanner or detector interface devices aligned to coded portions of an overlay in a touch pad housing. However, it does not discuss a probe device that transmits a selected portion of an image printed on an off-line medium (such as a book or a magazine) to a computer.

With respect to independent claim 1, the examiner, on page 7 of the office action, equates the limitation of claim 1's "computer storage medium", with that of the description of column 5, lines 52-54 of the Clancey reference. A closer read of the citations, and the Clancey reference in its entirety, teaches otherwise. Specifically, column 5, lines 52-54 of the Clancey reference teaches a database that stores information stored in the world model. Applicant would respectfully like to refer the examiner to column 5, lines 16-19 of the Clancey reference that provides an explanation of records retained by a world model. Absent in the citations and the Clancey reference in its entirety is storage medium retaining multimedia data representative of an output of a real tool (such as a microscope or X-Ray device).

With respect to independent claim 1, the examiner, on page 7 of the office action, equates the limitation of claim 1's computer that retrieves multimedia data "synchronized to said position", with that of the description of column 45, lines 31-53 of the Clancey reference. A closer read of the citations, and the Clancey reference in its entirety, teaches otherwise. Specifically, applicant contends that column 45, lines 31-53 of the Clancey reference merely teach the synchronization of timing between clients in the simulation by an event manager. However, it does not discuss the synchronization of a region of off-line media detected by the imager to the electronic media and also does not discuss a presentation method that presents electronic media based on this synchronization.

Hence, applicant contends that independent claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Clancey and Combs references.

Applicant wishes to state that the arguments presented above with respect to independent claim 11 substantially apply to dependent claims 2-15 as they inherit the limitations of the claims from which they depend.

Furthermore, applicant wishes to state that the arguments presented above with respect to independent claim 16 substantially apply to dependent claims 18 and 20-28, as they inherit the limitations of the claims from which they depend. Additionally, the dependent claims 18 and 20-28 require the data displayed by a computer to be synchronized to a selected region of off-line medium (such as a book or a magazine). However, the applicant contends that the Clancey reference does not teach the synchronization of a region of off-line media detected by an imager to the electronic media.

Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Clancey, in view of U.S. Patent 6,515,988 (Eldridge et al.), hereafter Eldridge and in further view of U.S. patent 6,434,403 (Ausems et al.), hereafter Ausems. To be properly rejected under U.S.C. §103(a), each and every element of the claims must be addressed through known prior art or be recognized as an obvious variation thereof. Applicant contends that the combination of the Clancey, Eldridge and Ausems references fail to provide many of the limitations of claims 29 and 30.

The examiner asserts that Clancey provides for a method and apparatus to model behavior. With respect to independent claim 29, the examiner, on page 25 of the office action, equates the limitation of claim 29's real tool that is simulated and a computer that displays data, with that of the description of column 33, lines 27-57 of the Clancey reference. A closer read of the citations, and the Clancey reference in its entirety, teaches otherwise. Specifically, column 33, lines 27-57 of the Clancey reference teaches a Brahms model of an experienced worker that an intelligent agent consults to provide coaching to a user of a personal digital assistant that is linked to the agent. However, it does not teach the simulation of a real tool (such as a microscope or X-ray device) in which a computer displays data based on a selection of a location of an image.

With respect to independent claim 29, the examiner, on page 25 of the office action, equates the limitation of claim 29's hand-held probe for selecting a location of an image printed on an off-line medium, with that of the description of column 5, lines 15-28 and figure 2 of the Eldridge reference. A closer read of the citations, and the Eldridge reference in its entirety, teaches otherwise. Specifically, column 5, lines 15-28 and figure 2 of the Eldridge reference, merely teaches a number of machines, each of these machines being able to communicate with portable computing devices and a number of processor controlled devices such as printers and scanners being connected to a network. However, it does not provide a hand-held probe being able to select a location of an image printed on an off-line medium such as a book or a magazine.

With respect to independent claim 29, the examiner, on page 25 of the office action, equates the limitation of claim 29's icons printed on an off-line medium, with that of the description of column 7, lines 9-12 of the Ausems reference. A closer read of the citations, and

the Ausems reference in its entirety, teaches otherwise. Specifically, column 7, lines 9-12 of the Ausems reference, teaches a display with icon that the user can select to initiate a listing of email addresses. However, it does not teach an off-line medium with icons printed thereon, each of them indicating a different real tool (such as microscope or an X-Ray machine).

With respect to independent claim 29, the examiner, on page 25 of the office action, equates the limitation of claim 29's position information representative of a location of said image, with that of the description of column 5, lines 36-47 of the Ausems reference. A closer read of the citations, and the Ausems reference in its entirety, teaches otherwise. Specifically, column 5, lines 36-47 of the Ausems reference, merely teaches a PDA telephone with a GPS receiver for receiving signals from satellites for calculating position of the PDA telephone. However, it does not teach receiving position information representative of a location of an image printed on an off-line medium (such as a book or a magazine).

With respect to independent claim 29, the examiner, on page 25 of the office action, equates the limitation of claim 29's hand-held probe part, with that of the description of column 4, lines 42-43 and figure 2 of the Eldridge reference. A closer read of the citations, and the Eldridge reference in its entirety, teaches otherwise. Specifically, column 4, lines 42-43 and figure 2 of the Eldridge reference, teach a portable computing device. However, it does not teach the hand-held probe part pointing to a location of an image printed on an off-line medium (such as a book or a magazine).

With respect to independent claim 29, the examiner, on page 25 of the office action, equates the limitation of claim 29's synchronization of data to said location, with that of the description of column 7, lines 45-52 of the Ausems reference. A closer read of the citations, and

the Ausems reference in its entirety, teaches otherwise. Specifically, column 7, lines 45-52 of the Ausems reference, merely teaches the synchronization of the PDA telephone with a computer system to transfer files. However, it does not teach the synchronization of data to the location of an image printed on an off-line medium selected by the probe.

With respect to independent claim 29, the examiner, on page 25 of the office action, equates the limitation of claim 29's examining a location of an item of an image and displaying data representative of an output of a real tool, with that of the description of column 7, lines 37-41 of the Ausems reference. A closer read of the citations, and the Ausems reference in its entirety, teaches otherwise. Specifically, column 7, lines 37-41 of the Ausems reference, teaches the presenting of positional information such as latitude and longitude to the user. Furthermore, the citations teach a GPS engine manipulating buttons by touch screen. However, it does not teach the displaying of data representative of an output of a tool such as an X-Ray machine or microscope based on the synchronization of data to the location of the image selected by the probe.

Hence, applicant contends that independent claim 29 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Clancey, Eldridge and Ausems references.

Applicant wishes to state that the arguments presented above with respect to independent claim 29 substantially apply to dependent claims 30 and 31, as they inherit the limitations of the claim from which they depend.

SUMMARY

Applicant has amended the specification to remove the embedded hyperlinks or other browser-executable code as requested by the Examiner. Applicant also submits herewith an Information Disclosure Statement for the articles cited in the application, but not yet included in a PTO-1449. Further, Applicant electronically filed an Information Disclosure Statement for those U.S. patents referenced in the application but not yet properly cited in an IDS. Applicant attaches herewith a copy of the Acknowledgement Receipt and Electronic IDS as proof of the submission. Consideration of these references is respectfully requested.

As has been detailed above, none of the references, cited or applied, provide for the specific claimed details of applicant's presently claimed invention, nor renders them obvious. It is believed that this case is in condition for allowance and reconsideration thereof and early issuance is respectfully requested.

This amendment is being timely filed within the set period of response, therefore, no petition for extension of time or associated fee is required. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies in the fees provided to Deposit Account No. 12-0010.

If it is felt that an interview would expedite prosecution of this application, please do not hesitate to contact applicant's representative at the below number.

Respectfully submitted,

Ramraj Soundararajan
Registration No. 53832

1725 Duke Street
Suite 650
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 838-7683
January 4, 2005

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT RECEIPT

Electronic Version 1.1
Stylesheet Version v1.1.1

Title of Invention	MANIPULATION OF ELECTRONIC MEDIA USING OFF-LINE MEDIA

Submission Type: Information Disclosure Statement

Application Number: 09/883376 *09/883376*

EFS ID: 75188

Server Response:

Confirmation Code	Message
ISVR1	Submission was successfully submitted - Even if Informational or Warning Messages appear below, please do not resubmit this application
ICON1	1059
USPTOEFSNotice	For assistance with e-filing a patent application, contact the Patent Electronic Business Center: Toll-Free Number:1(866) 217-9197 Website: http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/

First Named Applicant: THOMAS ZIMMERMAN

Attorney Docket Number: ARC920000049US1

Timestamp: 2005-01-03 15:52:20 EDT

From: us

File Listing:

Doc. Name	File Name	Size (Bytes)
us-ids	1001796-usidst.xml	3780
us-ids	us-ids.dtd	7763
us-ids	us-ids.xsl	12026
package-data	1001796-pkda.xml	1747
package-data	package-data.dtd	27025
package-data	us-package-data.xsl	19263
	Total files size	71604

Message Digest: 050e034f4a9e2fb3281ef9780cf5f8f096838c12

Digital Certificate Holder Name: cn=Jaclyn A. Schade,ou=Registered Attorneys,ou=Patent and Trademark Office,ou=Department of Commerce,o=U.S.

Government,c=US

ELECTRONIC INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Electronic Version v18
Stylesheet Version v18.0

Title of Invention	MANIPULATION OF ELECTRONIC MEDIA USING OFF-LINE MEDIA

Application Number: 09/883376 *09/883376*
Confirmation Number: 1059
First Named Applicant: THOMAS ZIMMERMAN
Attorney Docket Number: ARC920000049US1
Art Unit: 2123
Examiner: THOMAS H STEVENS
Search string: (5652412 or 6281888 or 5945980 or 5565658 or 5686705 or 6650320 or 6757686 or 6009198 or 6691126 or 6594383 or 6469706 or 6178417 or 6180444 or 5953457).pn.

US Patent Documents

Note: Applicant is not required to submit a paper copy of cited US Patent Documents

init	Cite.No.	Patent No.	Date	Patentee	Kind	Class	Subclass
	1	5652412	1997-07-29	LAZZOUNI ET AL.		178	18
	2	6281888	2001-08-28	HOFFMAN ET AL.	B1	345	179
	3	5945980	1999-08-31	MOISSEV ET AL.		345	173
	4	5565658	1996-10-15	GERPHEIDE ET AL.		178	19
	5	5686705	1997-11-11	CONROY ET AL.		178	19
	6	6650320	2003-11-18	ZIMMERMAN	B1	345	179
	7	6757686	2004-06-29	SYEDA-MAHMOOD ET AL.	B1	707	100
	8	6009198	1999-12-28	SYEDA-MAHMOOD		382	215
	9	6691126	2004-02-10	SYEDA-MAHMOOD	B1	707	102
	10	6594383	2003-07-15	SYEDA-MAHMOOD	B1	382	162
	11	6469706	2002-10-22	SYEDA-MAHMOOD	B1	345	589
	12	6178417	2001-01-23	SYEDA-MAHMOOD	B1	707	3
	13	6180444	2000-08-22	SYEDA-MAHMOOD		382	186
	14	5953457	1999-09-14	TUCKER ET AL.		382	233

Signature

Examiner Name	Date